

The declaration says that Cuccia Wilson Sanderson, PLLC “spent 39.3 hours prosecuting this case.”³ But that’s about it. Beyond that, it alleges in conclusory fashion only that (1) “[t]he fees were reasonable for the services performed,” and (2) “[t]he fees charged are those customarily charged in this area for the same or similar services.”⁴ Once again, the Court has no idea “where th[at] amount[] came from.”⁵ The Court doesn’t know which attorneys worked on the case, the attorneys’ experience levels, the attorneys’ hourly rates, the tasks performed, or the hours spent on each task.⁶ Romack’s failure to provide that information hobbles the necessary reasonableness determination that the Court must conduct.

Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Romack’s motion for attorney fees. [Doc. 15]. Romack may file a new motion to recover attorney fees by September 6, 2023 providing the information specified above. The Court warns Romack that this will be its last opportunity to request attorney fees.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 16th day of August, 2023.



BRANTLEY STARR
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

³ Doc. 15-1 at 1.

⁴ *Id.* The motion itself says that the hourly rates were \$375 for partners and \$305 for associates. But that’s not in a declaration format, and it doesn’t specify which attorneys charged those rates.

⁵ Doc. 13 at 5.

⁶ A time-keeping log often helps in that assessment.